

Application Serial No.: 09/189,543
Filing Date: November 10, 1998

REMARKS

Claims 37-47 and 51-62 were pending in this application. Claims 37, 51, 56, 57 and 63 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims in a subsequent patent application. Claims 38, 40, 44-47, 52 and 54 are amended to remove dependency from non-allowed claims. The rest of the amendments serve only to change dependencies of claims. Claims 64-68 are new. These claims track the language of claims 58-62 yet change the dependency from a composition claim to a method claim. Support is found throughout the specification and in the claims as filed. No matter has been added by way of these amendments. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments.

Interview

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to discuss the rejection of claim 55 in a teleconference on August 20, 2004. In the teleconference the Examiner indicated that Claim 55 should not have been included as a rejected claim. The Examiner and Applicant's representative agreed that this response to office action would note the status of claim 55 as not rejected. As such, Applicant believes that claim 55 is allowable.

RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 37, 38, 40-47, 51-55 and 58-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Pinkel (USPN 5,837,196). Applicant respectfully traverses. However, in an effort to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant has canceled the rejected independent claims and amended the remaining rejected dependent claims to depend from claims that were objected to but have been amended herein to be in independent form. Applicant notes that independent claim 55 was rejected. However, further to the teleconference with the Examiner on August 20, 2004, Applicant notes that this rejection was in error. As such,

SF-1149839_1

Application Serial No.: 09/189,543
Filing Date: November 10, 1998

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is moot. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of the claims.

Claim Objections

Claims 39, 56, 57 and 63 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In response, Applicant has amended the claims as noted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests notification that the objection has been withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant notes that the claims are ready for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide early notification to this effect.

Please direct further questions in connection with this application to the undersigned at (415) 781-1989.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Dated: August 23, 2004

BY:

David C. Foster

David C. Foster, Reg. No. 44,685 for
Robin M. Silva, Reg. No. 38,304
Filed under 37 C.F.R. § 1.34(a)

Customer Number: 32940
Dorsey & Whitney LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 3400
San Francisco, CA 94111-4187
Telephone: (415) 781-1989
Facsimile: (415) 398-3249

SF-1149859_1